



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

able in all directions, and therefore presupposes motion ; and that the so-called infinity and infinite divisibility of space are the inability of the mind to perceive or imagine a space which is not bounded by circumjacent space and ideally divisible, just as we cannot conceive a number which is not susceptible both of increase and diminution.

GOESCHEL ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF CARL FRIEDRICH GOESCHEL BY SUSAN E. BLOW.

CHAPTER III—(*Concluded*).

The Triplicity of the Proofs of Immortality.

We have authenticated historically the relative order of the theological and psychological proofs, and justified this order in the development of thought. It remains necessary to consider the position of Consciousness, for it is in Consciousness that we find the above-mentioned order of proof. The spires of a cathedral shift with the varying standpoint of the beholder ; may not the position of the proofs vary with the standpoint of the thinker before whose mental gaze they are unfolded ?

The conscious starting-point of the process of proof is the difference between the visible and invisible, between being and essence, body and soul. Underlying this starting-point is the implicit presupposition of the difference between subject and object. Otherness is already recognized, and the proofs of personal immortality arise in the effort to protect the Individual as *Monad* from this otherness. Hence the standpoint of Reflection or difference is implied in the whole process of proof both in the theological and psychological spheres, as well as in the development of the concept of the soul itself from Individuality to Personality. With reflection, philosophy, in its dialectic form, begins, and through this dialectic comes to more profound analysis and more inclusive insights. From the standpoint of reflection the starting-point is the near and visible object, and from this transition is made to the object invisible and remote ; the mediation consists in the progress from the determined to the self-determining, from that which is willed to Absolute Will. The last and highest point reached is

the interpenetrating identity of opposites, with which the standpoint of dualism is annulled, since it ascribes objective reality to the notion which is still subjective.

Philosophy, as Phenomenology, necessarily begins with the standpoint of Reflection. The beginning of the development of humanity, however, lies back of Reflection. As we fix our eyes upon this more remote beginning, the standpoint of Reflection becomes the second in order, and the relative position of the three proofs is also reversed. Henceforth the first is second, and the last is first. The starting-point is found in the sphere of the ontological proof, which, abstracted from the external scholastic form belonging to developed reflection, and particularly to dogmatism, finds its ultimate ground and unconscious presupposition in the immediate unity of the subjective and objective concept. The unity here referred to is the *first* immediate unity which precedes all difference, not the *secondary* immediate unity, which, in the progressive development of the concept, is found on both sides of the first explicit difference, and resolved by further analysis into secondary difference. Thus, after the first distinction of soul from body, the soul is apprehended as an immediate unity, which again breaks into difference in Consciousness. In other words, the soul is first apprehended as unity in its distinction from the body. Therefore the soul is a secondary unity, *i. e.*, its distinction from the body logically precedes its recognition as unity. In its next phase the soul, as consciousness, has its difference in itself. This is the secondary difference. In the development of man the starting-point is the primary unity and undivided Totality of body and soul. This condition corresponds with the ontological proof; the *ὄν* and the *λόγος* are still one; man is still one with his life; death cannot conquer life, but life remains after death. Thus Thales could say: *ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν διαφέρει τῆς ζωῆς*. In this condition, however, the immediate conviction neither needs nor seeks proof. Upon this standpoint the idea of God and the idea of immortality are not distinguished from their reality; born in the thinking subject, they commend themselves immediately as having objective validity. The ontological proof, therefore, in its immediate form, corresponds with the historic proof considered in the Introduction; it is this moment also, which, apparently shattered by the Understanding, glides, nevertheless, through all the thorny paths into

which the soul wanders, and, unseen, performs its duty. It helps us while we scorn it, and supports us while we tread it under foot. It has been already said that the *weight* of the historic proof is found in the intuitive conviction of the majority of mankind; it may now be added that its *energy* is verified in the Plus which belongs to positive faith in its opposition to the negativity of empty doubt.

Granting, then, that the starting-point of development is the immediate unity of being with the future, of Thought with its Actuality, it follows that its second phase is the Proof; this is the standpoint of Reflection or Difference, whose two sides are in the theological sphere, the cosmological and teleological proofs, and in the psychological sphere the metaphysical and moral proofs. In general, proof first appears in the stage of Reflection; it is the effort to unite the two sides of a dirempted unity; its starting-point is Being, which, as objectively given, is again differentiated, the process of proof moving forward on the one hand directly from Being to its Actuality, and on the other hand from Being backward to Essence, and thence to the future of this past.

Evidently, therefore, within the domain of proof the third member is wanting, for the third member has become the first, and the first and second members fall together as the opposite sides of the second sphere. Only through speculative insight into the immanent movement of the Concept is the dogmatic process of proof transformed and completed by the addition of the third moment. This speculative development comprehends within itself the preceding stages of the Spirit, and attains, finally, Mediated Unity, or Personality. In this consummation of the process of development is first made explicit the meaning of the statement that the soul is one with its body, and that the life of the soul is one. The soul anticipates not another life, but the development, renewal, and transfiguration of this life; the soul does not go over into something else, but in otherness remains itself. Only by going back of Consciousness is the true beginning found, the ground of experience discovered, and the whole sphere of thought in its complete Articulation surveyed. Grounded beneath and realized above, the proofs appear in a new light, and, as we trace their shining outlines, we know that the future and complete history of the doctrine of immortality will recognize within the spheres of

the separate proofs the same triplicity which we have striven to show in the totality of proof.

It is also worthy of mention that, having assigned to Consciousness the second place in the order of development, we recognize in history the *foundation*, in the continuous process of history the *development*, and in comprehended history the *culmination* of the doctrine of immortality or science of the finite spirit. History has no object other than Thought.

Relatively to our present standpoint the succession and connection of the proofs in Plato's "Phædo" are most remarkable. Socrates starts from negation, or, more definitely, from the conception of death, and shows that throughout the realm of existence negation negates itself; that everywhere life rises triumphant out of death, and asserts itself as persistence. In that existence affirms itself it has the supremacy over death, which denies itself. The correspondence with the ontological proof is evident (sections 70-72). Next arises spontaneously the second proof (section 72 *et seq.*), which, originating from reminiscence, points through this faculty to the past of the soul, and then infers the capacity and destiny of the soul to develop this past which has no beginning through a future which has no end. As life is in contradiction to death, as self-affirmation is relatively to negation, such is the reminiscence of the soul relatively to the infinite and increasing past which lies behind the soul. In both these proofs the soul is seized in its relationship to what is other than the soul; the third proof seizes the soul in its relationship to itself, and from the power of reminiscence deduces internality or simplicity (section 77).

Thus the indicated reversal of the order of the three proofs of immortality is found also in Plato. Not only does the content of the third proof apprehended as the first moment precede the first and second proofs, but these also change their position relatively to each other.

Whoever has carefully followed the course of development up to this point must have observed an apparent transformation of the first two proofs. Originally, Simplicity, which was the underlying ground of the first proof, was grasped as the *existence* of the soul, and the teleological determination which was the ground of the second proof was apprehended as the nature of the

soul. Next, without reversal of the relative order of the two proofs, the nature of the soul was found in the content of the first proof, and its existence or corporeality relegated to the content of the second proof. Finally, when the realized content of the third proof revealed itself as the ultimate starting-point and final goal of the process of proof, the other proofs fell together in the second sphere, and, as belonging to the same sphere, first asserted and then reversed their position. The central point of this total movement is the relationship between Existence and Essence; its various phases are explained by the mutation and confusion of this relationship, and the explanation of this confusion lies in the nature of Reflection. This reflection first seizes the internality in which it reflects itself as existence—in fact, as the real and indestructible existence saved out of the first diremption. Renewed reflection sunders this existence and finds in its *determination* its *essence*; in its *further* progress it finds the *essence* of determination to be self-realization or incarnation. Herewith the moment of existence becomes persistent in the second proof, and essence as moment retreats into the first proof.

In the “Phædo,” after the gradual exposition above referred to, the first proof is more clearly defined as ontological, and the second stands out more and more boldly as the practical proof.

In section 95 Socrates returns to the conceptions of origin and decay, and shows that they belong to Nature or Being. Spirit, however, is higher than Nature; therefore Anaxagoras is commended, though in him the Spirit is still hampered by Being.

Finally, Socrates grasps the soul, not as a thing, but in the totality of its form. The total form or concept of the soul is life, or, more adequately, Thought. The concept cannot be the opposite of itself; what is, is either living or dead; life cannot be also death; the one excludes the other; this is the *argumentum exclusi tertii* (sections 102–105). Thus, while in the earlier part of the conversation Socrates taught that everything proceeds from its opposite, and life rises triumphantly out of death, he now, in antagonism to Nature, demonstrates in the Logos exactly the reverse—viz., that what is cannot be or become its own opposite. This apparent contradiction in his teaching is solved in section 105, wherein he shows that change belongs only to Nature, or the external appearance of things, while duration and unchangeable-

ness belong to the Concept. This Concept—the Logos—is the true Actuality, *ὄντως ὄν*; to it alone belongs reality. Such is Plato's Ontology! In the sphere of manifestation we see the warm grow cold and the living creature die; but, in the Concept, warmth can never take up cold in itself; life cannot be also death. The soul is this total Concept of life. With this insight the apparent contradiction is so completely solved that we even find the ground of that external appearance within whose sphere positive Being arises out of the Negation of Being. This ground is the vital Concept which, dwelling within the object, excludes its own opposite. This is one of Plato's most profound insights; from it he passes to the poetic conception of Metempsychosis. In the same way he returns, finally, to the second proof, which, developed out of reminiscence, leads from the past into the future; reminiscence mediates the conception of reward and punishment (section 107); herewith the second proof shows itself to be the practical proof.

Herewith the whole course of the soul's thought of itself is completely changed. And what we discover in the universal history of philosophy is repeated step by step, though more rapidly and invisibly, in the experience of each philosophic thinker. Each individual must relive the whole history of philosophy. The beginning is always the same: Thought outgrows and awakes from the immediate unity and certainty which, in its ontological truth, is subsequently expressed in the historic proof. This is the first dualism—Being and Non-Being—Life and Death. It may, therefore, be said that Thought proceeds from Being, but it is from Being in its universality; more definitely, from the triumph of Being over Non-Being, for out of Non-Being, in all the transformations which we call death, Being emerges victorious and imperishable. Next, as in the "*Phædo*," Reflection turns upon the one side toward Being in its subjectivity, or, in other words, toward Thought in past and future infinity (this is the *ratio cognoscendi* in its subjectivity), and upon the other side toward Being in its objectivity, the nature of which, recognized as simplicity, proves finally to be Thought itself (this is the *ratio essendi* in its objectivity). The consummation of development is the comprehension and inclusion in the Concept, *i. e.*, in the Concept to which belongs Being, more definitely in Consciousness, the Being that

knows, and the Knowing that is, the Thought which is one with its Actuality. In the "Phædo" there is transition from the Ionian Nature-Philosophy to Thought—viz., to νοῦς, and with this to λόγος.

Such is the course of Consciousness; but thereupon arises an observation which the candid mind cannot ignore—an objection which, though abrupt and seemingly accidental, demands serious attention. The beating pulse of this objection is—death! Who is he that, searching for immortality, dares to ignore death?

It is, indeed, with death that we begin the investigation of that which is the contradiction of death. Here is the starting-point of Socrates; he looks full in the eyes of the death which faces him. Death is the origin of the doctrine of immortality! The doctrines of the imperishability of being and the immortality of consciousness are equivalent to an open declaration of war against death, but this very declaration implies that death stands ready and armed upon the battle-field. Being and Non-Being—the living Soul and Death—meet in mortal conflict. Who can deny that death has entered into the world? Who can deny that it has found a place in the consciousness of man? *Homo mortis sibi conscius!* With this admission would seem bound up the final and irrevocable overthrow of the ontological proof—that proof upon which rests the whole psychological process of proof—that proof with which the struggle began and with which it had seemed victoriously to end. For the ground of this proof is the ineradicable Concept of persistence, the testimony of consciousness to its own imperishability; and now, alas! death has stolen into this consciousness, and, like a gnawing worm, threatens to destroy its flower and fruit! All is vanity! all passes away! Man himself is conscious of death! Herewith human Consciousness contradicts itself as life and death contradict each other, for in man there dwell together the consciousness of death and the consciousness of the impossibility of death. The former rests upon man's alienation from the Absolute Life and Consciousness, the latter is grounded in that Union with the Absolute Life which is revealed in Creation and in the uninterrupted active continuance of Creation.

Herewith all contradictions are finally solved! For, if the consciousness of death finds its explanation in alienation from the

divine life—if sin, and sin only, is the sting of death—then Redemption is the source of a fresh and self-renewing life. We must, therefore, not overlook the fact that this truth is the ultimate, though long unrecognized, ground, origin, and end of the psychological process of proof. The consciousness of personal imperishability and the imperishability of personal consciousness is, in truth, nothing but the subjective consciousness of participation with God through the Redemption, or, in general, the Concept of Personality. The outcome of the ontological proof is thus the central fact of the Christian revelation ; it is, therefore, both dogmatic and ethical, or the unity of the objective and subjective—the theoretical and practical proofs. Its utterance is nothing other than “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?”

As consciousness in general, as well as the consciousness of imperishability in particular, bears in itself the proof of imperishability, so the indwelling consciousness of sin and death, far from contradicting immortality, is correctly apprehended as the lever of life, and the very first factor of the proof of immortality. Consciousness finds a limit in its object only in so far as it transcends this object. It would not be conscious of its object if it experienced no opposition from this object, and it would not feel this opposition if its force did not reach beyond the object. Hereupon rests, in general, the moral proof, and hereupon rests also that form of the moral proof which is developed out of the consciousness of death. Consciousness of death points beyond life and beyond nature, for this consciousness is the exclusive privilege of man ; it is the blessing bestowed in the curse pronounced after the fall. It points to the freedom of the human will, wherein is expressed man’s divinity ; it points *backward* to freedom, for the consciousness of death is one with the consciousness of guilt ; it points forward to freedom, for it admonishes man to turn to a new life. Hence it points to the concept of justice, which develops from the concept of freedom, and to the truth of persistence, which develops from the concept of justice.

It may be said that man knows himself to be immortal just because he is conscious of death ; for to be conscious of death is to know death as a limit, and to know a limit is to transcend it. This development belongs to the second sphere of proof, but it goes

over through this into the third proof, because from the consciousness of death follows the consciousness of its opposite, or the concept of imperishability, the one, indeed, being identical with the other. By a similar process the first proof discovers the immateriality of the soul; the soul is immaterial because it is conscious of matter. Finding its limit in matter, it logically transcends this limit.

Thus the argument against immortality derived from the concrete representations of death and of the consciousness of death is not only refuted by these same representations, but is challenged thereby to self-comprehension and insight, to a richer unfolding of its content, and to a more profound explanation of the doctrine of immortality. The ultimate result is that mortality is the path to immortality.

In thus assuming the burden of its own Apologetics, philosophy not only instructs others, but enriches itself. It finds renewal in the freshness of concrete representation, and gains strength and versatility through the manifold vicissitudes of the strife. This result, however, will not satisfy philosophy itself; rather, in proportion to its exoteric expansion, will it feel the need of esoteric development. The deeper its penetration into all spheres of manifestation, the more surely it realizes that it must collect and orient itself. The esoteric movement in philosophy consists in following out the adequate logical categories, in tracing the total concepts of particular appearances, and in seeking for the primitive phenomena so variously reflected in the sphere of representation. Without this esoteric activity, each argument, in its refutation, leads to a new objection, and we are ceaselessly whirled around in the infinitude of particulars which the representation pictures.

Thus, out of the brilliant refutation of the argument from the consciousness of death rises the fresh objection that, if consciousness of an object proves superiority over it, then man, being conscious of God, must be superior to God. To this, without transcending the sphere of representation, it may be immediately answered that the consciousness of an object does not prove abstract and unconditioned superiority to it, but the consciousness of an object transcends this object only in so far as the latter is opposed to the former, or is, in other words, *mere object*. In such a case

Consciousness takes up its object as a moment of itself. But if, on the contrary, the object of consciousness is not merely object, but also subject, then we have Consciousness opposed to Consciousness, life to life. Herewith opposition is transformed into reciprocal relationship, and only from the further determinations of these related consciousnesses can we learn how far either one transcends or is subordinate to the other. The application of this remark is evident. In so far as death is merely the object and contradiction of life and consciousness, it is transcended by Consciousness, which therein proves itself immortal. But, when the object of Consciousness is Self-Consciousness itself, Consciousness is identical with its object, and, when the object is Absolute Self-Consciousness, the reciprocal relationship consists in the participation of the finite consciousness through Personality in the Absolute Consciousness.

In what has been said we may find also a path to the most universal category which underlies the conception of death. Death is—Negation. Negation is the universal truth of death; in Negation death finds its speculative significance. In this universality as Negation death moves through all phases of the doctrine of immortality. This insight casts a new light upon that path of psychological development which we have retraced so many times. First, Negation appears as death, hence as the contradiction of life and consciousness—but in the felt ascendancy of life and consciousness this death itself dies. This is the standpoint of the immediate certainty of persistence after death. Next, Negation appears transformed as matter (externality, plurality), in which form it is again negated by the Soul, which herewith recognizes itself as immaterial (internal, simple). Its next disguise is finitude, against which, in protracted struggle, Thought proves its own infinitude. Finally, Negation appears in its own form, with which it at once negates itself. With this Negation of Negation, Being and Thought affirm themselves as Spirit. The Negation of Negation is the end of all Negation and the absorption of all death—the self-affirmation and the self-perpetuation of Consciousness. Even this result, however, is abstract and unsatisfactory until vitalized in the concept of continuous creation, and quickened through that communion with the Creator without which man can neither be nor think himself. Finally, Continuous Creation, adequately ap-

prehended, is that Redemption and Reconciliation through which alone the personality of man is secure.

As we now again glance backward upon the original order of the successive grades of consciousness, and try to recall their objective image as an illustration of internal development, there arises spontaneously the remembrance of that transcendental schematism wherein Kant sought to exhibit the presumptive paralogism in rational psychology. The truth of this schema is found in our original order of succession. In the critical deduction, too, the starting-point is immediate unity—it is seized as Substance in its unity with the subject. The soul is this substance or base of the body, and herewith immateriality. The truth of matter is the immaterial. The second phase is the difference into which the original unity breaks; therefore this second phase has two sides or limbs, for substance as regards its quality is simple, and a monad, and consequently incorruptible; and its identity as intellectual substance gives, in Kant's phraseology, the conception of personality or consciousness of itself and of its other. The third stage in which the tension of the two sides is cancelled is, according to Kant's terminology, Spirituality, or Immortality, and implicit in it is the truth which we have learned to know as the Personality of the spirit in its living Actuality. The truth is therefore this, that to Thought the immediate unity of Substance breaks into Individuality and Subjectivity, and from this diremption returns to a higher unity in the Spirit.

We must not overlook the fact that the psychological schema traced and explained in the "Critique of Pure Reason," while it is based immediately upon the triplicity of the Category of relation, rests also upon the fourfoldness of the Table of Categories, its middle term being double. Upon this basis of Relation rests also the psychological development in Dr. K. Ph. Fischer's recent work on the "Science of Metaphysics"—a volume which, as the result of reverent yet independent investigation, challenges our warmest thanks and admiration, while its incompleteness needs to be mentioned in the interest of philosophic truth. Developing the soul in its threefold relationship to itself, to the world and to God, Dr. Fischer fails to comprehend that relationship to God and to the world are really the two sides of the middle sphere of proof, while the final and inclusive sphere demands recognition of the

identity of the finite and Absolute spirits. It is characteristic of piety, in its less developed though still praiseworthy forms, to insist that philosophy shall culminate in God, and that religion, as the relationship of man to God, shall mark the highest stage of insight. The truth, however, is that God in his objectivity is not the final goal of Thought, as the Israelitish faith is not the highest religion. The consummation and the crown of Thought is God in his Personality, or that participative identity of the Absolute Spirit with the finite Spirit which in the form of feeling is love, and in the form of Thought is Absolute Recognition. The soul cries out not for God in his abstraction and isolation, but for God, in Christ, through the Spirit.

In the order of human development the starting-point is the Ego in itself; in virtue of its unconscious objectivity, it is still one with God and with the world. In the next stage the Ego appears in its separation from God and from the world. On one side stands the individual man; on the other side stands God; beneath man is nature, and beside him his brother man. Finally, the Ego reappears in God—in that communion with God whose solution is Personality.

In man the Ego is first and last, the Alpha and the Omega. With this egoism is seized in its barren abstraction, but the abstraction is at once negated, the brittle isolation annulled! The answer to the enigma is found, and this answer is Personality.

The concept of personality casts the final light upon the efforts of the Understanding to prove personal persistence. In this light egoism is transfigured and glorified, and the living truth which underlies pantheistic self-renunciation revealed. We can, therefore, only repeat that as the truth of Being is Self-Consciousness, so the Actuality of Self-Consciousness is Personality. And while on the one hand, in the consummation of development, all the demonstrations of the Understanding are focalized in the Concept of Personality, this same concept is, on the other hand, the implicit ground of every proof; it is the unexpressed and unrecognized presupposition which gives convincing force to the partial utterances of the separate proofs—the truth which overpowers and convinces before it is named and known. Naturally, therefore, the necessary result of progressive development has been the increasing recognition of the Concept of Personality as the Principle of

Psychology. Upon this recognition are based all those recent psychological investigations which seize the soul speculatively as immortal or actual. All these investigations agree in calling experience to the aid of abstract thought in order thereby to discover the content of the given form, and thus attain to concrete truth. Experience is apprehended as externalized thought or as the material provided by Absolute Thought for the purposes of development and actualization. Through insight into this experience we learn the form of the Spirit in its particular manifestations.

It is interesting to notice that these speculative essays, while grounded in the same principle, develop in two different directions. On the one hand we have the *Æsthetico-religious* doctrine of immortality represented particularly by C. H. Weisse, and on the other the *Physio-theological* doctrine of immortality, the most noted exponent of which is J. H. Fichte.

The *Æsthetico-religious Anthropology* begins by rejecting the abstract and unpicturable conception of the soul as separate from the body. Vindicating the corporeality of the soul, it vindicates its immortality, and, though there is nothing new in its fundamental conception, it is original in the results which it develops from this conception. Conformably with its theory, it announces itself not as a psychological but as an anthropological system. It finds the general concept of Corporeality in logical Thought, but does not find therein its concrete truth; it turns, therefore, to the concrete intellectual contemplation of corporeality, which, as the finite in identity with the Infinite, or as the body in immediate union with the Spirit, is the phenomenon of Beauty. Thus, corporeality, "through the indwelling of the Absolute Spirit, is stamped with immortality." This concrete intellectual contemplation, it is next declared, goes hand in hand with experience; we have it by living it. By means of such experience "the higher corporeality shows itself not unrelated to the present mortal and transitory corporeality." This relationship is mediated in Absolute Corporeality, which is defined as the creative power that renews all created corporeality. This corresponds essentially with the thought of continuous creation. In the nature of creation is expressed its purpose, which purpose leads by the teleological path to personal immortality; this immortality is possible only through the persist-

ence of the same body, and therefore presupposes between death and the resurrection an intermediate state in which the soul is not bodiless. Corporization is the indispensable condition of personification ; its presupposition is that creative force of Absolute Personality which itself is presuppositionless. Through experience thus contemplated it grows clear, also, that the purpose of creation, which is imperishability, is disturbed by sin ; through sin death has entered into the world. This original purpose of creation will be restored when death is overcome, and to overcome death God must be made flesh, and communicate eternal life to the world.

Again we observe that the starting-point is the unity of the Soul with the body in the Spirit. The distinctive peculiarity of this system is, that it rejects all abstraction and makes explicit the full validity of that corporeality in which the Soul is realized as Spirit. This development moves principally within the sphere of the second proof in both its theological and teleological directions. It teaches that the Spirit is individual and personal in proportion to what it possesses of the substance of the Absolute and Eternal ; “for this substance, far from robbing it of Personality, really first forms it into Personality, and is able, under all conditions to generate anew that body with which it cannot dispense.”

Very similar is the procedure of the physiological or anthropological-theological method. Fully equipped, logically and ontologically, it traces experimentally all particularly given analogies, obtains information from physiology and physiognomy, from phrenology and craniology, from animal magnetism and somnambulism, and follows all the footprints of organism in order to conquer for corporeality on all sides that which justly belongs to it. The truth is, that the body is the expression of the Soul as individual. Granted, that the ground and essence of all reality is the Soul, the indestructible basis of the manifold is the Simple. This “Simple” is the “Monad” of Leibnitz and the “dynamic quality” of Herbart. Adequately apprehended, it is nevertheless, in time and space, a soul and body ; it is the *embodied* Idea. Hereupon rests all generation which throughout all its stages is nothing but the self-projection of the Idea which thus actually begins to be, and out of darkness emerges into light. Thus originates the Monad,

and its body, of which the external palpable body is merely the manifestation. Death is the separation of the internal body of the Soul from its outlived husk, and the process of death is far more gradual than is generally supposed.

One cannot fail to recognize that this development emanates from the content of the first proof, and finds its completion in the sphere of the second proof. With respect to the latter, the first point to be noticed is, that Consciousness has a night-side, out of which it develops continuously toward the light. In this life the night-side is never wholly overcome; therefore Consciousness demands a further development; only under the condition of persistence can Consciousness realize itself by turning all its darkness into light. This is that teleological moment of the second proof which rests upon the principle of perfectibility. This insight does not, however, exclude the possibility of the destruction of Consciousness, for when Consciousness has realized all its potentialities, and thus fulfilled the purpose of Creation, why should it not pass away? This doubt finds its solution in the theological phase of the second proof. Through it we learn that the finite spirit, begotten by God, is appointed to participation with God; we are taught this through the revelation made in the incarnation of God. God has revealed himself in the flesh—corporeality and finitude are impregnated with God. The spiritual bread of life (*pabulum mentis*) is God in his revelation. This bread of life is inexhaustible, consequently the finite spirit is imperishable. Its nourishment can never fail, and nourishment is the physiological condition of persistence.

So much with regard to the two speculative developments of Personality, which, in accordance with its own Concept, includes bodily persistence. In both, the night-side of Consciousness is experimentally verified. In their detail much is left undeveloped, and there remain many interwoven conceptions which lack transparency and mediation. In the discussion of the where of the Soul after death (with Fichte), we become involved in conceptions which involuntarily suggest Philo's spirits of the air. This question, together with many others, demands more definite development. But, notwithstanding all their defects, these speculative developments have incontestably one distinctive merit. They exhibit, more clearly than has ever been done before, the moment of

Corporeality; they seize this moment æsthetically, and, by the aid of analogies, follow it out physiologically, showing conclusively that the body is the immanent organ of the Soul, identical with its Content, and penetrated by the Spirit.

It may, perhaps, be helpful to refer in this connection to the views of immortality and resurrection which are developed in that Dialogue of Æneas of Gaza, known under the name of "Theophrastus." According to this dialogue, the Soul, as reasonable *λογική* and morally free, is immortal through its communion with God, and the body of this soul, through participation with the soul, *διὰ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς κοινωνίαν*, is withdrawn from the power of death, which prevails only over what is devoid of reason and consciousness. "For," he continues, "our soul is immortal; coming into union with the body, it leaves in it the germ of immortality. And the greatest of all these creations or begettings on the part of the Demiurgus is man. Hence there is nothing that belongs to the essence of man that can perish entirely."

This concept of soul-permeated corporeality has, however, its presupposition in Personality: this Personality we have recognized as the concrete concept of the Spirit; only in the light of this concept is the body transfigured and transparent. This transparent corporeality in its final analysis is the obedience of the body to the soul in the spirit—an obedience which is free because identical with that which determines it. The final consummation is the obedience of creation toward God in God. Therefore it has been said that all the paths of God end in corporeality.

. Upon this fundamental insight rest the confessions of Heinrich Steffens, published about four years since, though, being derived from experience and meditation, they present this insight only in its crude, immediate form. The life of nature throughout all its degrees—so runs the confession—points both backward to the mystery of its beginning, and forward to its final purpose. All organization, throughout the spheres of nature, consists both in the externalization of a hidden internality and in the fusion of the external with this internality, or, in other words, both in the incarnation of souls and the permeation and transfiguration of bodies. "No body, no soul; no corporeality, no spirituality." In time the present is the central point; without a past there is no present; without a future there is no actuality. And as all that

exists exists in this middle point of time, so man is the middle point of this constantly appearing creation. "In the complete integrity of his existence lies a past which was before all appearance, and a future which shall be after all appearance." The former is the night, or body; the latter is the light, or soul; the union of the two is life.

Such are the reflections through which we are led to the concept of Personality. Personality consists both in the incarnation of the soul, through which is attained Individuality, and in the penetration of the body by the soul, wherewith the soul stamps the body as its possession. Personality consists, therefore, in the fusion of body and soul—human personality in accordance with its concept in the complete unity and purity of human existence. But just for this reason human personality finds its ground and goal in the Absolute Personality of God, and the ground and goal of renewal after its purity has been darkened in the incarnation of God. By this human personality is proved immortal.

"As the rays of light are refracted in each eye, and, without disturbing, intersect each other; as in every melody waves of sound pierce and thrill through each other, and, while separate, are yet inwardly united—so, had humanity kept its first estate, would each human personality live in and with all others, each separate personality confirming and strengthening all others, and being by all others strengthened and confirmed, while all together swelled the harmony of an ever-blessed existence." And even though original purity has been clouded and mankind subsists no longer in this transparent and harmonious personality, though nature and body have become impenetrable and the Soul impure, "the germ of Personality, the germ of penetrability [*i. e.*, mutual participation] and of purification," has never perished. "It must be presupposed in each, and union with it is the sure road to blessedness." It takes place through union with Christ as a fact of experience, and by this He puts on the form of man and becomes personal.

Personality is the end of the journey toward God.